

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 GENEVA 07544 01 OF 02 181739Z

46

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 IO-10 ISO-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-05 L-02

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05

ACDA-05 BIB-01 DODE-00 CU-02 /083 W

----- 101894

R 181535Z DEC 74

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 9726

INFO ALL CSCE CAPITALS 225

AMEMBASSY OSLO

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USLO SACLANT NORFOLK VA

USDOCSOUTH

CINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 GENEVA 7544

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: CSCE, PFOR, XG, PARM

SUBJECT: CSCE POLICY: CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURES; UK PAPER
ON MOVEMENTS

1. GIVE BELOW IS TEXT OF NEW UK PAPER ON ISSUE OF PRIOR
NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS WHICH BRITISH
ARE CIRCULATING TO ALL NATO DELEGATIONS. BRITISH ARE
REQUESTING THAT THE PAPER, WHICH HAS FCO APPROVAL, BE
FORWARDED TO CAPITALS FOR STUDY DURING THE RECESS. THEY
HAVE EXPRESSED THE HOPE THAT OTHER NATO DELEGATIONS, AND
IN PARTICULAR US DEL, WILL RETURN TO GENEVA PREPARED TO
DISCUSS THE PAPER IN DEPTH AT A CAUCUS SOON AFTER THE
CSCE RESUMES. THE PAPER REVIEWS NEGOTIATIONS ON THE
MOVEMENTS ISSUE, EXAMINES VARIOUS ALTERNATIVE COURSES
OF ACTION AND ESSENTIALLY ADVOCATES THAT NATO ALLIES
AGREE TO PROVISION WHICH WOULD LEAVE NOTIFICATION OF
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 GENEVA 07544 01 OF 02 181739Z

MOVEMENTS TO THE DISCRETION OF PARTICIPATING STATES.

WE WILL NEED WASHINGTON GUIDANCE BY LATE JANUARY ON
HOW TO RESPOND TO THIS UK PROPOSAL.

BEGIN TEXT:

CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURES: MOVEMENTS

(1.) EASTERN DELEGATIONS HAVE MADE IT PLAIN THAT THEY
ARE NOT PREPARED TO DISCUSS FURTHER DRAFTING FOR THE
PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS UNTIL THERE IS A GENERAL
WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT THEIR COMPLETELY-AND UNCHAINGINGLY-
NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARDS ANY SUCH MEASURE EMERGING
FROM THIS CONFERENCE. NEUTRAL AND NON-LIGNED DELEGATIONS
CONTINUE TO EXPRESS KEEN INTEREST IN THE SUBJECT, BUT
THEIR LATEST IDEAS, THOUGH REVEALING A WILLINGNESS TO
ACCEPT A HALF-WAY MEASURE FOR THE PRESENT, SEEM LIKELY
TO BE JUST AS UNACCEPTABLE TO THE EAST.

(2.) WE SHOULD THEREFORE CONSIDER OUR OWN ATTITUDE SHOULD
THE EAST SHOW NO SIGN OF MODERATING THEIR PRESENT POSITION.
WE MUST BEAR IN MIND THAT ONE SENTENCE HAS ALREADY BEEN
MENTALLY REGISTERED:

"IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE
HELSINKI CONSULTATIONS THE PARTICIPATING
STATES STUDIED THE QUESTION OF PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF
MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS".

(3.) THERE ARE THREE MAIN OPTIONS:-

I) NO REFERENCE TO MOVEMENTS AT ALL. THIS WOULD NOT
FULFIL THE HELSINKI MANDATE WHICH (PARAGRAPH 23)
SPECIFICALLY ASKS THAT CONCLUSIONS BE SUBMITTED. SUCH
A BURIAL WITHOUT TRACE WOULD NOT BE ACCEPTABLE TO US OR
TO THE NEUTRAL/NON-ALIGNED DELEGATIONS, OR PERHAPS
EVEN, THOUGH FOR DIFFERENT REASONS, TO THE EAST.

II) A NEGATIVE CONCLUSION, EG:

A) "THE PARTICIPATING STATES HAVE CONCLUDED THAT
NO ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR
MILITARY MOVEMENTS IS AT PRESENT PRACTICABLE."
SUCH A STATEMENT WOULD NOT REFLECT THE WILLINGNESS OF
MANY STATES TO IMPLEMENT SUCH A MEASURE.

B) "THE PARTICIPATING STATES HAVE BEEN UNABLE TO REACH
ANY COMMON CONCLUSION ON THIS SUBJECT."
SUCH A STATEMENT, THOUGH TRUE, WOULD MARK A STEP BACK-
WARD FROM PARAGRAPH 23 OF THE HELSINKI RECOMMENDATIONS
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 GENEVA 07544 01 OF 02 181739Z

WHICH BY IMPLICATION AT LEAST ACCEPTS THAT THE PRIOR
NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS IS A CONFIDENCE-BUILDING
MEASURE.

III) MINIMAL CONCLUSION. IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE TO
ACHIEVE SOME RECOGNITION OF THE VALUE OF THE PRIOR
NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS.

(4.) IN THE BELIEF THAT SOMETHING CAN STILL BE SALVAGED
FROM THE STAGE II DISCUSSIONS, THIS PAPER IS DEVOTED

TO A STUDY OF(3)(III) ABOVE.

THE SOVIET/CZECH PROPOSAL:

(5.) THE SOVIET PROPOSAL, WHICH SEEKS TO INDICATE THAT THE TIME IS NOT RIPE FOR A MEASURE OF THIS KIND, IS UNACCEPTABLE, NOT LEAST BECAUSE IT TRIES TO ATTRIBUTE THIS VIEW TO ALL DELEGATIONS:

"THE PARTICIPATING STATES HAVE CONCLUDED THAT THE CONSIDERATION OF THE QUESTION OF PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS CAN BE RESUMED LATER WHEN THE CLIMATE OF DETENTE IS REINFORCED IN THE EUROPEAN CONTINENT AND THE EXPERIENCE IS ACCUMULATED OF THE EXERCISES OF THE INITIAL MEASURES OF STRENGTHENING CONFIDENCE AND STABILITY, IN PARTICULAR OF SUCH A MEASURE AS PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MANEUUVRES."

THE SOVIET PROPOSAL DOES HOWEVER CONTAIN THREE ELEMENTS WHICH COULD BE DEVELOPED DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY:-

(I) THE IMPLICATION THAT THE PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS DOES INDEED FALL INTO THE CATEGORY OF CONFIDENCE-BUILDING;

(II) THE (UNACCEPTABLE) SUGGESTION THAT DETENTE IN EUROPE IS AT TOO PRIMITIVE A STAGE FOR SUCH A MEASURE;

(III) THE SUGGESTION THAT EXPERIENCE OF THE MEASURE FOR THE PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MANOEUVRES MIGHT FACILITATE LATER AGREEMENT ON ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS.

ESSENTIAL MINIMUM CONCLUSION:

(6.) THE IMPLICATION OF THE SOVIET PROPOSAL, AND OF WHAT THE BULGARIAN REPRESENTATIVE SAID IN THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON 3 DECEMBER, IS THAT THE EAST MAY BE PREPARED TO RECOGNISE THE CONFIDENCE-BUILDING VALUE OF THE NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS, PROVIDED THAT THEY CAN LIMIT THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE TO LITTLE MORE THAN THAT. THE NEUTRAL/CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 GENEVA 07544 01 OF 02 181739Z

NON-ALIGNED DELEGATIONS HAVE MADE IT PLAIN THAT SOME SUCH STATEMENT IS ESSENTIAL TO THEM. ALL ALTERNATIVES WOULD BE BASED UPON THE THOUGHTS IN THE FOURTH, FIFTH AND SIXTH PRE-AMBULAR PARAGRAPHS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION TABLED BY THE UNITED KINGDOM, CSCE/II/C/12:-"RECOGNIZING THAT IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES MILITARY MANOEUVRES CAN GIVE RISE TO FEARS OF A POSSIBLE THREAT OR USE OF FORCE; "CONSIDERING THAT SUCH FEARS MAY ARISE IN A SITUATION WHERE THE PARTICIPATING STATES LACK CLEAR AND TIMELY INDICATIONS OF EACH OTHERS INTENTIONS; "CONVINCED THAT THE PROVISION OF RELEVANT INFORMATION ON A CLEARLY DEFINED BASIS WILL CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR OBJECTIVE OF STRENGTHENING CONFIDENCE AND INCREASING STABILITY AND SECURITY;"

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 GENEVA 07544 02 OF 02 181703Z

46

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 IO-10 ISO-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-05 L-02

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05

ACDA-05 BIB-01 DODE-00 CU-02 /083 W
----- 101376

R 181535Z DEC 74

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 9727

INFO ALL CSCE CAPITALS 226

AMEMBASSY OSLO

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USLO SACLANT NORFOLK VA

USDOCSOUTH

CINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 GENEVA 7544

(7.) SUCH ALTERNATIVES MIGHT SAY EITHER

(I) THAT THE NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS WOULD CONTRIBUTE TO THE SAME OBJECTIVES OF CONFIDENCE-BUILDING AS THE NOTIFICATION OF MANOEUVRES, EG: "THEY RECOGNISE THAT SUCH NOTIFICATION WOULD CONTRIBUTE TO THE SAME OBJECTIVES AS THE PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MANOEUVRES/TO STRENGTHENING CONFIDENCE AND INCREASING STABILITY AND SECURITY". OR

(II) THAT THE PARTICIPATING STATES COULD CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR COMMON OBJECTIVES OF CONFIDENCE-BUILDING BY GIVING NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS, EG: "THE PARTICIPATING STATES RECOGNISE THAT THEY CAN CONTRIBUTE FURTHER TO THE STRENGTHENING OF CONFIDENCE AND INCREASING SECURITY AND STABILITY IN EUROPE BY A MEASURE SUCH AS THE PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS".

ADDITIONAL MINIMUM CONCLUSIONS:

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 GENEVA 07544 02 OF 02 181703Z

(8.) SINCE EITHER OF THE ALTERNATIVES IN PARA 7 ABOVE CAN HARDLY BE ADEQUATELY SELF-CONTAINED AS A CONCLUSION TO THE STUDY OF MOVEMENTS, THERE REMAINS THE QUESTION OF WHAT MORE COULD BE SAID. THE FOLLOWING ALTERNATIVES DESERVE CONSIDERATION

A) DISCRETIONARY IMPLEMENTATION:

(9.) SUCH A TEXT MIGHT READ:-

"THE PARTICIPATING STATES HAVE CONCLUDED THAT IT SHOULD BE LEFT TO THE DISCRETION OF PARTICIPATING STATES, AS A CONTRIBUTION TO THEIR COMMON OBJECTIVES OF CONFIDENCE-BUILDING IN EUROPE, TO PROVIDE PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF THEIR MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS."

(10.) THIS TEXT WOULD MEET THE DESIRES OF MANY STATES. FURTHER STUDY COULD BE GIVEN TO THE NEED TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS:-

(I) "ON A VOLUNTARY BASIS". THIS WOULD UNDERLINE THE OPTIONAL CHARACTER OF THE MEASURE.

(II) SOME SUCH PHRASE AS "IN A SPIRIT OF RECIPROCITY AND GOODWILL TO ALL PARTICIPATING STATES" OR "WITH DUE REGARD FOR BALANCED AND RECIPROCAL PRACTICE". THIS WOULD SAFEGUARD PARTICIPANTS FROM THE GREATER PRESSURE WHICH MIGHT BE FELT BY SOME GOVERNMENTS TO IMPLEMENT THE NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS REGARDLESS OF WHETHER OTHER STATES WERE DOING SO TOO.

B) DETENTE NOT YET RIPE

(11.) THIS IDEA MIGHT BE REFLECTED IN THE TEXT IN PARAGRAPH 9 ABOVE BY THE INSERTION AFTER "CONCLUDED" OF THE WORDS "AT THIS STAGE".

(12.) ALTERNATIVELY A FULLER TEXT MIGHT READ:-

(I) "THE PARTICIPATING STATES HAVE CONCLUDED HOWEVER THAT NO ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS ARE FEASIBLE AT THE PRESENT STAGE OF DETENTE IN EUROPE AND/OR UNTIL THEY HAVE HAD SOME EXPERIENCE OF THE EFFECTS OF THE PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MANOEUVRES."

OR

(II) "THE PARTICIPATING STATES HAVE CONCLUDED HOWEVER THAT THEY CANNOT DRAW UP APPROPRIATE ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS UNTIL THEY HAVE HAD SOME EXPERIENCE OF THE EFFECTS OF THE PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 GENEVA 07544 02 OF 02 181703Z

MANOEUVRES."

(13.) THE DIFFICULTY WITH EACH OF THE TEXTS IN PARA 12

ABOVE IS THAT SUCH A VIEW CANNOT BE ATTRIBUTED TO ALL
DELEGATIONS (AND CERTAINLY NOT TO NATO DELEGATIONS)
AND DOES NOT FIT IN WITH THE APPROACH OF DELEGATIONS
ELSEWHERE IN THE CONFERENCE. ANOTHER ALTERNATIVE THERE-
FORE SIMPLY MIGHT BE TO INDICATE DISAGREEMENT, EG:

"THE PARTICIPATING STATES HAVE HOWEVER BEEN UNABLE
TO REACH ANY FURTHER COMMON CONCLUSIONS AT THIS STAGE."

(14.) THE TEXTS IN PARAS 12 AND 13 ABOVE MIGHT IN ANY
CASE INVITE SOME FURTHER ADDITION ALONG THE FOLLOWING
LINES:

"THEY THEREFORE INVITE PARTICIPATING STATES/THOSE PARTICI-
PATING STATES WHO HAVE PRESENTED PROPOSALS TO STUDY
UPON THE VIEWS WHICH HAVE BEEN EXPRESSED AT THE CONFERENCE
WITH A VIEW TO FURTHER CONSIDERATION AT AN APPROPRIATE
TIME/AT A LATER STAGE IN THE PROCESS OF STRENGTHENING
SECURITY AND PROMOTING CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE."
END TEXTABRAMS

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: CBMS, POLICIES, MEETING DELEGATIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 18 DEC 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: ElyME
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974GENEVA07544
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D740368-0343
From: GENEVA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19741226/aaaaawic.tel
Line Count: 294
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 6
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: ElyME
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 29 MAY 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <29 MAY 2002 by boyleja>; APPROVED <26 MAR 2003 by ElyME>; APPROVED <26 MAR 2003 by ElyME>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE POLICY: CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURES; UK PAPER ON MOVEMENTS
TAGS: PARM, PFOR, XG, UK, CSCE
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005